



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,424	09/24/2003	Frank Berendes	CH-7929/LcA 36,206	5072

34947 7590 05/10/2007
LANXESS CORPORATION
111 RIDC PARK WEST DRIVE
PITTSBURGH, PA 15275-1112

EXAMINER

RAHMANI, NILOOFAR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/10/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/669,424	Applicant(s) BERENDES ET AL.	
	Examiner Niloofer Rahmani	Art Unit 1625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) ~~filed on~~ RCE filed on 03/13/2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-16 and 19-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-16 and 19-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☒ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 10-16 and 19-24 are pending and claims 1-9, and 17-18 are cancelled.

2. ***Priority***

This application is RCE filed on 03/13/2007, which claims the priority of GERMANY 10244811.6, filed on 09/26/2002. The claimed benefit of priority date is denied. There is no certified translation of the priority document. The filing date of the instant application is 09/24/2003.

3. ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 10-16, and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 10-16, and 19-24 are drawn to "reducing" in part (a) of claim 10, which has no antecedent basis in the specification.

This is a NEW MATTER rejection. Removal of all new matter is required, In re Russmussen 210 USPQ 325.

4. Claims 10-16, and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 10-16, and 19-24 are drawn to "cell preparations" in part (a) of claim 10, which has no antecedent basis in the specification.

This is a NEW MATTER rejection. Removal of all new matter is required, In re Russmussen 210 USPQ 325.

5. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 10-16, and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or

with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification lacks enablement of the term "microorganism", which is claimed in the compound claims. While enabling for some microorganism examples, which are on pages 20-23 of the instant specification, it is not seen where this is enables for Rhizopus or other types of microorganism. Therefore, the specification lacks enablement for the term "microorganism" beyond the microorganism disclosed on pages 20-23 of the instant specification.

6. Claims 10-16, and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 10-16, and 19-24 are drawn to microorganism with no limitation to the species. There is no record for any deposit in the prosecution record. What species in the genus "microorganism" makes the compound or do the entire genus "microorganism" make the compound? Under what conditions is this compound made? If so, then enablement is needed for that. Any species embraced by the genus including future development must be deposited in compliance with MPEP§ 2404.

To satisfy the enablement requirement a deposit must be made "prior to issue" but need not be made prior to filing the application. *In re Lundak*, 773 F.2d 1216, 1223, 227 USPQ 90, 95 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

MPEP

37 CFR 1.803(d) indicates that once a depository is recognized as suitable for the purposes of this rule, or has defaulted or discontinued its performance under this section, notice thereof will be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office. A current list (as of January, 1998) of IDAs recognized under the Budapest Treaty, with addresses, is included below. The mere fact that a deposit has been made in one of these depositories does not mean that the terms of the deposit meet either the requirements of the Budapest Treaty or the deposit regulations. Many of the depositories recognized under the Budapest Treaty have many different arrangements under which biological material may be stored.

37 CFR 1.808 requires that the deposit of biological material be made under two conditions:

(A) access to the deposit will be available during pendency of the patent application making reference to the deposit to one determined by the Commissioner to be entitled thereto under 37 CFR 1.14 and 35 U.S.C. 122, and (B) with one exception, that all restrictions imposed by the depositor on the availability to the public of the deposited biological material be irrevocably removed upon the granting of the patent.

The one exception that is permitted is specified in 37 CFR 1.808(b) which permits the depositor to contract with the depository to require that samples of a deposited biological material shall be furnished only if a request for a sample, during the term of the patent, meets any one or all of the three conditions specified in this paragraph. These conditions are:

(A) the request is in writing or other tangible form and dated; and /or
(B) the request contains the name and address of the requesting party and the accession number of the deposit; and /or

(C) the request is communicated in writing by the depository to the depositor along with the date on which the sample was furnished and the name and address of the party to whom the sample was furnished.

It should be noted that this exception to the general rule that all restrictions will be removed must be strictly followed and that no variations of this explicit exception will be accepted as meeting the conditions of this section. Although this exception is consistent with the provisions in the Budapest Treaty and its implementing regulations (Rule 11.4), other conditions on accessibility are permitted under the Budapest Treaty as

Art Unit: 1625

prescribed by national law. Consequently, the mere indication that a deposit has been made under conditions prescribed by the Budapest Treaty would satisfy all conditions of these regulations except the requirement that all restrictions on access be removed on grant of the patent. Ex parte Hildebrand, 15 USPQ2d 1662 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1990).

The specification does not satisfy the Budapest Treaty and US required assertion of removal of all restrictions. As such, the deposit in the specification is insufficient for US Practice. MPEP 2402 specifically identifies the criteria necessary if the deposit was not made according to the Budapest Treaty.

7. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 10-16, and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 10-16, and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The claims lack written description for microorganism. What species of the microorganism make the compound with the certain deposit #? Does the species of the microorganism in all conditions make the

instantly claimed compound? Due to this, the specification lacks description of "microorganism".

8. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 10-16, and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification lacks enablement of the term "cell preparations", which are claimed in the compound claims. While enabling for some cell preparation examples using microorganisms, which are on pages 20-23 of the instant specification, it is not seen where this enables for other types of cell preparation. Therefore, the specification lacks enablement for the term "cell preparation" beyond the cell preparation disclosed on pages 20-23 of the instant specification.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Niloofar Rahmani whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 1625

571-272-4329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang, can be reached on 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NILOOFAR RAHMANI

05/07/2007

NL


MARGARET SEAMAN

PRIMARY EXAMINER

GROUP 1625